United Nations
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
EIGHTEENTH SESSION
Official Records

THIRD COMMITTEE, 1262nd MEETING

Wednesday, 13 November 1963, at 3.20 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Chairman: Mr. Humberto DIAZ CASANUEVA (Chile).

Organization of work

1. The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that on Wednesday, 20 November, the General Assembly, in plenary session, would examine the draft United Nations Declaration on the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination. That document was intended to have the same effect on world public opinion as the United Nations Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Declaration of the Rights of the Child, and the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples. It was therefore highly desirable that the Assembly should be able to adopt it unanimously. Several delegations had therefore started negotiations to work out a final text that might receive universal support. He had been asked by the General Committee to request those delegations to speed their negotiations.

2. He observed further that the Committee was considerably behind in its work and could not consider in detail all the items on its agenda. It might therefore wish to consider applying some of the methods recommended in the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Improvement of the Methods of Work of the General Assembly (A/5423), in so far as they dealt with the improvement of the methods of work of Main Committees. The establishment of working groups, which would function simultaneously with the Committee and endeavour to reconcile different points of view, would be particularly useful for that purpose. The Committee would thus be able to present specific proposals to the Assembly on agenda items which it could not fully consider.

AGENDA ITEM 48

Draft International Covenants on Human Rights (A/2907 and Add.1-2, A/2910 and Add.1-6, A/2929, A/5411 and Add.1-2, A/5462, A/5503, chap. X, sect. VI; E/2573, annexes I-III; E/3743, paras. 157-179; A/C.3/L.1062, A/C.3/L.1171, A/C.3/L.1174, A/C.3/L.1176) (continued)

ARTICLE 4 OF THE DRAFT COVENANT ON CIVIL AND POLITICAL RIGHTS (concluded)

3. U MYAT TUN (Burma) said that the Saudi Arabian amendment to paragraph 2 (A/C.3/L.1171) had little relevance to Burmese traditions in marriage. Article 22 dealt primarily with the part played by the State. In Burma the State played no significant part in the legalizing of marriage, which resulted essentially from an agreement entered into freely by a man and a woman. Burmese marriage, which did not have to be solemnized before the civil authorities, nevertheless entailed certain clearly determined rights and duties.

4. His delegation also considered that, in time of public emergency, the State should be entitled to suspend or restrict the exercise of certain rights in order to protect its security. In particular, it should be free in time of war to prevent marriages which would oblige it to give legal status or even citizenship to a national of the enemy country. In any case wars came to an end and, after the hostilities were over, persons could again exercise fully their right to marry and found a family.

5. For those reasons his delegation would vote against the Saudi Arabian amendment.

6. Mr. BEAUFORT (Netherlands) was not surprised that article 4 should give rise to lengthy debate. Its very necessity made its formulation difficult. Indeed, while it must be recognized that exceptional circumstance might necessitate suspension or restriction of the exercise of rights stated in the draft Covenant, care must be taken against authorizing an excessive number of derogations.

7. The Mexican and Saudi Arabian delegations had worked out a joint amendment (A/C.3/L.1176) to paragraph 3, which distinctly improved the original text, and his delegation would vote for it.

8. He could not, however, support amendment A/C.3/L.1171, despite the Saudi Arabian representative's eloquent defence of the right to marry, even in time of war or public emergency. On the invasion of the Netherlands by nazi troops in May 1940, the Netherlands Government had found it necessary to intern persons of German origin living in its territory, even if they were married to Netherlands nationals. That decision had been due to the need to protect the national security, and to the danger which nazi infiltration had presented to the country. If such a measure could be considered essential, a State should all the more be entitled to prevent marriages which would give enemy nationals their spouse's nationality.

9. Mr. ATAULLAH (Pakistan) associated himself with the delegations which had indicated that they would vote against the Saudi Arabian amendment. The right to marry was not, in his view, one of man's fundamental and inalienable rights. Proof of that was its subjection to certain restrictions even in normal

times: for instance, there were laws against marriage between close relations, and members of certain religious orders were called upon to renounce the right to marry. It would therefore be undesirable to place the right of marriage on an equal footing with the rights to life and liberty referred to in the articles listed in article 4, paragraph 2.

10. Mr. DELGADO (Senegal) said that, having listened to the telling arguments of the Saudi Arabian (1261st meeting) and Romanian representatives (1259th meeting), his delegation was convinced of the need to include article 22 among those from which no derogation should be permitted. Marriage was a sacred institution, both for individuals and for society, and should be respected in all circumstances. Moreover, as the Romanian representative had observed, the Saudi Arabian amendment raised no difficulties for countries whose legal systems were based on Roman law.

11. Mr. HAMID (Sudan) said that it would be against the tradition and religious convictions of his country to suspend the right stated in article 22 because of exceptional circumstances. His delegation would therefore vote for the Saudi Arabian amendment to paragraph 2.

12. Mr. DAYRELL DE LIMA (Brazil) said that he, too, would vote for that amendment.

13. Miss WACHUKU (Nigeria) observed that, under her country's laws, Nigerian citizenship was not conferred upon an alien who married a Nigerian woman. Since Nigeria had not been at war since its independence, her delegation found it hard to visualize all the practical consequences of the Saudi Arabian amendment, upon which it therefore reserved its position.

14. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) said that he was aware that his amendment presented difficulties for some delegations because of the constitutional provisions in effect in their countries. He wished to reiterate, however, that the Committee's task was not to adapt the draft Covenants to the terms of national constitutions; on the contrary, national constitutions should be recast to conform with the draft Covenants.

15. He was sorry that a narrow nationalist view of the State should seem to prevail in a United Nations body. Legal arguments had obscured the fact that, behind nationalities, there were individuals with sacred rights. His appeal was addressed to the conscience and the humanitarian feelings of the members of the Committee. He would hope that everyone fully realized the inhumanity of measures preventing persons from marrying solely because an accident of birth had given them different nationalities. In his view suspension of the right to marry, apart from encouraging illicit relations, was as wicked in wartime as in peacetime.

16. Marriage was to his mind no less, and perhaps more important, than religion, which nowadays tended increasingly to be supplanted by ideologies and to take purely social forms. Marriage, however, was the very cornerstone of society.

17. In view of the controversy to which his amendment had given rise, he agreed to withdraw it, but he was still deeply convinced of its merit. He greatly regretted that the Committee seemed to turn stubbornly towards the past rather than look to the future, that it tended to forget that the State should serve the people and not they the State, and that war continued to occupy minds when every thought should be directed towards peace.

18. The CHAIRMAN thanked the representative of Saudi Arabia for withdrawing his amendment, and called upon the Committee to vote on article 4 and on the amendment of Mexico and Saudi Arabia (A/C.3/L.1176) to its paragraph 3.

Paragraph 1 was adopted unanimously.

Paragraph 2 was adopted by 86 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Point 1 of the amendment (A/C.3/L.1176) to paragraph 3 was adopted unanimously.

Point 2 of the amendment (A/C.3/L.1176) to paragraph 3 was adopted unanimously.

Paragraph 3, as a whole, as amended, was adopted unanimously.

Article 4, as a whole, as amended, was adopted unanimously.

19. Mr. Antonio BELAUNDE (Peru) said that, although the wording of the article just adopted was somewhat unclear, his delegation had voted for it, on the understanding that the provisions of paragraph 3 did not affect the sovereign right of the State, stated in article 70 of the Constitution of Peru, to suspend the application of certain freedoms.

PROPOSAL TO INCLUDE AN ARTICLE ON THE RIGHTS OF THE CHILD IN THE DRAFT COVENANT ON CIVIL AND POLITICAL RIGHTS

20. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee should consider first of all the draft article on the rights of the child (A/C.3/L.1174), the inclusion of which in the draft Covenant on Civil and Political Rights was proposed by eight delegations, in order that the protection provided by article 22, paragraph 4, for children whose parents were separated might be extended to other categories of children. That addition to the provisions of article 22 had been proposed by the Polish delegation (A/C.3/L.943) as early as the sixteenth session.

21. During the seventeenth session certain delegations, including that of Chile had spoken in favour of including in the draft Covenant on Civil and Political Rights an article on the rights of the child, which would correspond to the provisions of article 10, paragraph 3, of the draft Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Other delegations had, instead, favoured the drafting of a convention on the rights of the child. Poland had submitted to the Committee a proposal (A/C.3/L.1014) that had been opposed by many delegations because it would give equal rights to children born in and out of wedlock; and Chile had submitted a proposal (A/C.3/L.1019) which avoided that difficulty by remaining more general.

22. After a very complicated debate the Committee had decided (1178th meeting), at the suggestion of several delegations, including that of Chile, to refer the question to the Commission on Human Rights. The Commission, at its nineteenth session, had studied a Polish and a Chilean draft, both of which were so worded as to permit the adoption of a compromise formula, but had not taken a decision. Its debates were summarized in its annual report to the Economic and Social Council (see E/3743, paras. 157-179).

23. The Committee should of course also take account of the Declaration of the Rights of the Child, which had been unanimously adopted by the General Assembly in its resolutions 1386 (XIV).

24. He regretted that the debates during the seventeenth session of the General Assembly should have been concerned chiefly with the nature of filiation—in other words, with the question whether equal rights should be accorded to legitimate and to natural children—to the detriment of the other basic aspects of child welfare mentioned in the Declaration of the Rights of the Child.

25. Sociologically the problem was causing great anxiety today, not only in the developed countries—where, according to educators, juvenile delinquency was increasing and children tended more and more to suffer from neuroses—but also, and especially, in the under-developed countries, where millions of children were also victims of poverty and malnutrition. In discussing the problem it was important not to lose sight of the eminently social nature of the concept of child welfare.

26. The Chairman invited the Committee to consider, first, whether it was necessary to include the proposed article in the draft Covenant; second, whether it was preferable to draft a convention, which according to some would be precluded by the adoption of an article; and lastly, what obligations to provide child welfare would be assumed by States.

27. Mrs. DEMBINSKA (Poland) said that the reason why her delegation had, as early as the sixteenth session, submitted a draft article on the rights of the child was its belief that, since the purpose of the draft Covenants was to convert into legal obligations the principles enunciated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, they should also include the principles proclaimed in the Declaration of the Rights of the Child, adopted during the fourteenth session of the General Assembly, and therefore after the Commission on Human Rights had drafted the Covenants. Those principles were very important, since children and young persons made up one third of humanity and were the weakest group in society; they required protection because their treatment affected their attitude towards life and their ability to overcome its difficulties.

28. The draft Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights included many of the principles proclaimed in the Declaration of the Rights of the Child but no provision regarding the child's legal status. His legal protection should therefore be guaranteed by the draft Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, which was the appropriate instrument for defending him against abuse of power and discrimination, Moreover, laws of that nature existed in many countries.

29. Since the Committee had not had time to consider the Polish proposal at the sixteenth session of the Assembly, it had done so at the seventeenth session. She had then made clear, in reply to certain objections, that there existed a right belonging specifically to the child, that of being fed and brought up by his parents; that the problem was not the same for other groups in society, particularly for the aged, who enjoyed all civil and political rights and needed only social assistance; that it was wrong to assume that the rights and freedoms provided by the Covenant also applied to children and young persons, who, since they were protected by adults, could not and should not exercise them fully; and that it was unrealistic to maintain that the family alone should bear responsibility for the child, since other influences were exerted upon him by educators, classmates and youth organizations or, if the last-named were lacking, influences with might be harmful.

30. When the General Assembly had, through the Economic and Social Council, referred to the Commission on Human Rights the revised proposal (A/C.3/L.1014/Rev.1) submitted jointly by the Polish and Yugoslav delegations, it had also asked the Secretary-General to transmit to the Commission the results of an inquiry he was to address to the Governments and specialized agencies (General Assembly resolution 1843 A (XVII)). The Commission on Human Rights had investigated primarily whether it was advisable to include the draft article in the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, and what would be the legal consequences of doing so, but had not studied in detail the contents of the draft article.

31. Like the debates in the Third Committee, the comments of the Governments and specialized agencies had shown that inclusion of the articles was favoured by many: she quoted the replies of Brazil, Tanganyika and UNESCO (E/CN.4/850 and Add.1). UNESCO believed, however, that the right to education pertained essentially to the draft Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, article 14 of which enunciated the right in detail; it had pointed out the danger of dealing with the same right in different terms in the draft Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

32. In order to take those comments into account, the sponsors of the draft now before the Committee had taken out of it the question of education and also the question of children born out of wedlock, which was too controversial.

33. By the words "special protection", in paragraph 1 of the article, the sponsors meant the totality of the measures establishing the child's legal status in the family and in society; those measures could, of course, be enumerated in detail only in the draft Covenant itself. She wished to analyse the part that should be played for that purpose by the family, the State and society.

34. The family was the natural environment of the child and, consequently, the unit of society best suited to ensure his development and the protection of his rights. Principle 6 of the Declaration of the Rights of the Child was very explicit in that regard and stated in particular that the child should "grow up in the care and under the responsibility of his parents". That provision, which defined the special status of the child, was not embodied in the draft Covenant. The important role of the family had, moreover, been recognized in the legislation of various countries—for example, in the Italian Constitution, the French Constitution, the Soviet law on the family and the Polish family code.

35. There was no denying, however, that some parents did not live up to their duties, as was shown by the great number of abandoned children in the large cities, and that others, by contrast, abused their parental authority, a problem which had been discussed at the United Nations Seminar on the Rights of the Child, which had been held at Warsaw in 1963. Polish legislation, in cases of that kind, allowed the guardianship authority—and more specifically, the district court—to abrogate, suspend or limit the authority of the parents after, of course, exhausting every other

means of compelling the parents to carry out their obligations towards their children.

36. In her view, laws for the protection of the child did not in any way weaken the family but, on the contrary, could only help to strengthen family ties, and that was the primary object, inasmuch as the child was entitled to be part of a family.

37. The State had to provide legal protection, not only for the children who were neglected by their parents but also for orphans. In many States that protection was provided by means of guardianship or adoption. In Poland, the guardian was appointed by a court; his decisions on important matters had to be approved by the guardianship authority, and his responsibility came to an end when the child attained the age of eighteen years. Adoption was often resorted to for young children so that they might again have a family life.

38. The function of the State did not, however, stop there, for the child also had to be protected against harmful influences. In most modern systems of law, penalties, varying in severity from country to country, were provided for adults who neglected their duties towards their children or impaired the children's morals. The Czech criminal code and the Hungarian criminal code were examples of such systems of law. The child also had to be protected against the dangers of his immediate environment, and in particular against street companions and influences and against alcoholism, a curse threatening young persons and children as well. Poland and other countries had resorted to penal measures in the fight against alcoholism and, in particular, had prohibited the sale of alcoholic beverages to minors. All those various forms of action constituted the special protection which the State must afford to children.

39. In addition to the family and the State, an important role in the protection of the child was played by society, through voluntary organizations which provided the child with material assistance; attended, on occasion, to his education and leisure-time activities; and took the initiative in fostering legislative and administrative action. The first Declaration of the Rights of the Child—the Declaration of Geneva, of 26 September 1924—[1]/ which had been sponsored by the League of Nations, had resulted from the action of organizations of that kind.

40. The co-operation of the family, the State and voluntary organizations was therefore the means of ensuring effective protection for the child.

41. She also stressed the serious problem of the increase in juvenile delinquency and vandalism, which affected most countries and which, although known under different names, always represented a violation of the rules of society. Comparative statistics of such phenomena were useless because the legal definition of the infractions and the age-group classification of adolescents varied from country to country. According to the specialists in the matter, the increasing gravity of the situation was due to the greater number of offences being committed by children and young persons, the seriousness of the offences and the fact that many of them were committed by organized groups of delinquents. Attention was now being concentrated on the social rehabilitation of youth, but the lack of sufficiently effective methods was keenly felt. The real need was for preventive action through the establishment of an effective system of child welfare, for juvenile delinquency was the product of an environment where there was no co-ordination between the various forms of action on behalf of children. Paragraph 1 of the proposed article (A/C.3/L.1174) might, if adopted, serve as the basis for such a system, and her delegation hoped to be able to submit a specific proposal in that matter in the near future.

42. Paragraph 2 of the article was related to the corresponding paragraph of Principle 3 of the Declaration of the Rights of the Child. A child must have the right to a name, because a name gave him a sense of identity and an awareness of his personality and dignity and of the fact that he belonged to a family. As regards nationality, its acquisition and loss were governed by different rules in each State. In some countries, the child acquired the nationality of his father without regard to the child's place of birth; in other countries, on the contrary, he acquired the nationality of the country in which he was born. It was thus possible for a child to be stateless, if he was born of stateless parents in a country belonging to the first category. Paragraph 2 of the proposed article was intended to eliminate statelessness among children as far as possible.

43. The adoption of the proposed article would fill a gap in the draft Covenant and give appropriate legal force to the provisions of the Declaration of the Rights of the Child. While she was fully aware of the advantages that would result from the eventual adoption of a convention on the subject, she felt that the possibility should not prevent the insertion of an article on the rights of the child in the draft Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

44. Mr. COMBAL (France) said that it had long been the aim of French legislation to ensure the protection of the child as fully as possible, and that accordingly his delegation was particularly sympathetic towards the generous and humanitarian spirit which had induced a number of countries to propose the insertion of a new article on the rights of the child in the draft Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The improvements made by the sponsors in the text which had been submitted at the seventeenth session, and the explanations of the Polish representative, had served to some extent to remove the objections that the French delegation had felt compelled to make regarding the principle of inserting the new article in the draft Covenant; but certain remarks were still called for.

45. First, with regard to the wording of the draft Covenants, the ideal would seem to be to treat of human rights in the abstract as a subject of law and thus avoid the risk of entering areas where the diversity of concepts and laws might prevent the Covenants from being universally applicable. In the particular case of children, there was the further broad difficulty that the term "child" was subject to a wide variety of definitions throughout the world. In a single country, for example, the age-limit of a child might differ as between civil law, criminal law and social legislation. The insertion in a legal document of a vague notion open to different interpretations would thus in itself be a clear disadvantage which should be remedied through the adoption, if possible, of some kind of criterion.

1/ See League of Nations, Resolutions and Recommendations adopted by the Assembly during its Fifth Session (September 1st to October 2nd, 1924), chapter VIII, section 6.

46. Turning to paragraph 1 of the proposed new article, he pointed out that the final phrase, while most certainly praiseworthy in intent, was too categorical. Although it was unthinkable that a child should be subject, where his rights were concerned, to any discrimination based on the sex, race, colour, social status or the religious or political convictions of his parents, it must be realized that, in the legislation of many countries, a distinction, at least with regard to civil rights, was made between children, according to whether they were legitimate or illegitimate or born of an adulterous or incestuous union. In many instances, the desire to protect the interests of legitimate children and defend the family was the reason for laws denying to children born out of wedlock the rights enjoyed by legitimate children in matters of succession—as was the case, for example, in France—or prohibiting any investigation of paternity that might serve to establish an adulterous or incestuous filiation. Those were the only distinctions between children that were prescribed by French law, for otherwise, and particularly with regard to social assistance, all children received equal treatment. The desire to protect the interests of the child was also the reason for prohibiting by law any official reference to the fact of illegitimate birth.

47. If, therefore, the proposed article was to be compatible with the various national systems of law, the words "without any discrimination" would either have to be eliminated entirely or would have to be replaced by the expression used in Article 1 (3) of the Charter, namely, "without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion".

48. In regard to the right to a nationality, mentioned in paragraph 2 of the new article, he felt that, just as an international convention would not settle uniformly all the nationality conflicts in the world, so, to include in the draft Covenant an article giving the child the right to a nationality might reduce the chances of the Covenant's universal application. For instance, although French law, in order to reduce the number of stateless persons, conferred French nationality on children born in France to unknown parents, and on foundlings, French nationality could not be systematically conferred on every child born in France to known parents of unknown nationality. In that case the child already had a family, and there could be no certainty that the family would not be claimed by some other State. A child born in France might therefore, at any rate provisionally, have no nationality. Similar problems must arise in other countries as well.

49. He did not object in principle to the inclusion of an article on the rights of the child, although these might of course be dealt with in a separate convention. For all the foregoing reasons, however, he asked the sponsors to refrain from mentioning nationality and to be good enough to bear in mind the difficulties he had indicated. The French delegation could not undertake commitments which French law could not allow to be fulfilled.

50. Mr. ATAULLAH (Pakistan) agreed with the Philippine representative's remark (1161st meeting) that the draft Covenant ought to be amended as little as possible, and would therefore hesitate to vote for any proposal that was not absolutely indispensable. His delegation acknowledged the need to protect and promote the health, education and normal development of all children without any discrimination. That protection was, however, already provided by the draft Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights in its article 14 (dealing with the right of everyone to education), 10 (dealing with the protection of maternity, the protection of the health and normal development of the child and the prohibition of exploitation), and 13 (concerning the right of everyone to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of health). Articles 6, 7 and 8 of the draft Covenant on Civil and Political Rights also protected children against all cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment and any kind of forced or compulsory labour. Children's rights against being subjected to discriminatory measures were precisely and, it appeared, adequately safeguarded by articles 2 and 24.

51. Since the problem of nationality had been recognized as highly complex and controversial, when the Covenants were drafted, it would be better not to mention nationality in any article concerning the rights of the child. Moreover, how a State could enforce the child's right to a name was by no means clear.

52. For all those reasons the Pakistan delegation would vote against the insertion in the draft Covenant of a new article on the rights of the child, and against the proposal in document A/C.3/L.1174.

53. Mr. GOODHART (United Kingdom) suggested that it might be better to draft rules applying to children than to concede them more rights. Nevertheless, the United Kingdom Parliament was constantly concerned to protect children's rights, and his country had in fact initiated the Declaration of the Rights of the Child. His delegation still thought that the wording of article 2 of the draft Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, adopted in the previous week (1259th meeting), with only two abstentions, was sufficiently precise to safeguard those rights.

54. No one could deny that children were individuals. Article 2, paragraph 1, covered the whole human race without exception. To adopt a new article indicating that certain individuals were "more equal" than others would be unnecessary, and indeed would detract from the universality of the Covenant. Admittedly equality was still far from achievement everywhere, but his delegation believed that article 2 should be its guarantee. He agreed with those who had warned the Committee against establishing inequality within equality, for equality was not a relative but an absolute term.

55. In dealing with the right to nationality of a child born out of wedlock, a difficulty arose from the conflict between two schools: that which held that a child derived it nationality from its parents; and that which held that nationality derived from the place of birth. Who, for example, was to ensure that a nationality was given to a child born out of wedlock on the high seas under a flag of convenience? The Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities was studying that very complicated question, and it was perhaps premature to take a firm stand. Moreover, it might be asked which authority would be responsible for enforcing the right. The Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness (A/CONF.9/15) had not yet been ratified, because of the technical difficulties, by any of the sponsors of the proposed new article or, for that matter, by any other State.

56. The Committee had recently (1251st meeting) adopted a draft resolution concerning the sessions of the Commission on Human Rights, in which it had stressed its reliance upon the Commission for the

preparation of studies on certain items and for the elaboration of suitable texts. He pointed out that the Commission had voted by a majority against the inclusion of an article on the rights of the child in the draft Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

57. Article 2 of each draft Covenant guaranteed the rights of children as individuals; and article 10 of the draft Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights prescribed special protection for them because of their immaturity. It was therefore unnecessary to include an additional article in the present draft Covenant.

58. Mrs. KUME (Japan) said that in her country children were protected like all other individuals, both by the general law and by social legislation.

59. Although Japanese law, in order to protect the institution of the family did not confer upon children born out of wedlock the same rights of succession as upon legitimate children, she would support paragraph 1 of the proposed new article. Paragraph 2 gave her delegation no difficulty, for every child born in Japan acquired Japanese nationality. She would therefore vote for the article; but she thought that its insertion in the draft Covenant was unnecessary because the rights of the child were already guaranteed by some other articles of the draft Covenant, especially by article 10, paragraph 2, of the draft Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights; and by article 22, paragraph 4, of the draft Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

60. Mr. DELGADO (Senegal) believed that the proposed new article would strengthen the Covenant; his delegation would therefore vote for it.

The meeting rose at 5.45 p.m.

Litho in U.N. 77301—March 1964—2,225